

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/939,896	08/27/2001	Lane W. Lee	M-12042 US	4074
75	590 12/10/2004		EXAM	INER
MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP			BAYAT, BRADLEY B	
SUITE 226	LOGY DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Jose, CA	95110		3621	
			DATE MAILED: 12/10/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\ \				
Advisory Action	09/939,896	LEE ET AL.	\				
Advisory Aution	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Bradley Bayat	3621					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 16 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a Ition in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	•						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:							
		SUPERVISORY PAT	RAINMELL ENT EXAMINER				

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's argument that "hindsight reasoning" is applied or a "granular file by file" revocation approach is novel fails to overcome the rejection; the access control rules and trust related information ensure that actions take place during the data connection in accordance with the access control rules and/or the trust information, to thereby ensure that authorization levels are not exceeded.